





UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,577 02/12/2001		Irene E. Kochevar	10284-018001	9723
20999	7590 12/02/2003	EXAMINER		
	R LAWRENCE & HAUGAVENUE- 10TH FL.	BARRETT, THOMAS C		
	K, NY 10151		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		3738	
			DATE MAILED: 12/02/2003	1)

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>	<u> </u>		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/781,57	7 -	KOCHEVAR ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary		Examiner		Art Unit				
			Thomas C.	Barrett	3738				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	nication appe	ears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN nsions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com period for reply specified above is less than thirty (period for reply is specified above, the maximum so the to reply within the set or extended period for repl reply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136 munication. 30) days, a reply v statutory period wil y will, by statute, c	6(a). In no ever within the statu ill apply and will cause the appli	nt, however, may a reply be tim tory minimum of thirty (30) days expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely, the mailing date of this con O (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.			
	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on 17 No	vember 20	03.					
•	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
3)	, _								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 21 and 22 is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-20 and 23 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
•—	ion Papers			1					
9) [10) [The specification is objected to by the The drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objected the Capplacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected to	e: a) acce ection to the d g the correction	epted or b)[Irawing(s) bo on is require	e held in abeyance. See ed if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFF				
•	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120								
a) 13)⊠ / s 3 a 14)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority 2. Certified copies of the priority 3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation See the attached detailed Office action Acknowledgment is made of a claim ince a specific reference was included 7 CFR 1.78. b) The translation of the foreign lay Acknowledgment is made of a claim eference was included in the first ser	y documents y documents s of the prioni onal Bureau on for a list o for domestic ed in the first inguage prov for domestic	have beer have beer ity docume (PCT Rule of the certif priority un t sentence visional app	n received. In received in Application received in Application ts have been received 17.2(a)). It is ideal copies not received as 5 U.S.C. § 119(a) of the specification or oblication has been received as 5 U.S.C. §§ 120	on No ed in this National S ed. e) (to a provisional edition in an Application E eived. and/or 121 since a	application) Data Sheet.			
Attachmen									
2) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)		·	4) Interview Summary 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 09/781,577

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION

The request filed on November 17, 2003 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 09/781577 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Oath/Declaration

The declaration filed on April 10, 2003 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the 102(e) rejection of the Murphy and Melke references and correct the declaration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As noted in MPEP 2173.05(u): "If the trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of the **35 U.S.C. 112**, second

Application/Control Number: 09/781,577

Art Unit: 3738

paragraph." LASIK is a trademark and is used in claims 14 and 20 as a limitation to identify or describe a particular product, Laser-Assisted *In Situ* Keratomileusis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-14, 17-20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Khadem et al. (5,552,452) as cited in applicant's IDS. Khadem et al. discloses a method for adhering tissue comprising: contacting a tissue with a photosensitizer, creating a tissue-photosensitizer mixture, applying electromagnetic energy without more than a 1 degree rise in temperature (col. 3, line 67- col. 4, line 3), and creating a tissue seal without contacting the tissue with an exogenous cross-linkable substrate (col. 7, lines 18-30). The method may comprise the use of Rose Bengal and energy applied at 600-670 nm (Table 1) or a thiazine (col. 4, line 64- col. 5, line 3), and can be used for refractive surgery (col. 8, lines 3-8). The methods can be used on humans and in vivo or ex vivo (col. 15, lines 39-47).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 09/781,577

Art Unit: 3738

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khadem et al. (5,552,452). Khadem et al. discloses a method for adhering tissue comprising: contacting a tissue with a photosensitizer, creating a tissue-photosensitizer mixture, applying electromagnetic energy without more than a 1 degree rise in temperature however Khadem et al. fails to disclose specific W/cm and J/cm ranges.

MPEP 2144.05 states:

II. OPTIMIZATION OF RANGES

A. Optimization Within Prior Art Conditions or Through Routine Experimentation

Generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation."

The general conditions of the claims are disclosed in Khadem et al. Khadem et al. discloses adhering tissue using a laser at wavelengths greater than 488 nm and a photosensitizer under conditions that minimize tissue damage (col. 2, lines 55-67). Lasers are well known in the art to have controllable energy doses and irradiances, such as the commercial ones admitted to by the Applicant (pp 15-16). The optimum ranges of energy doses and irradiances can easily be found through routine experimentation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of routine experimentation to determine the optimum ranges of energy doses and irradiances, to a method for adhering tissue as per Khadem et al., in order to minimize tissue damage.

Art Unit: 3738

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas C. Barrett whose telephone number is (703) 308-8295. The examiner can normally be reached Tuesday-Friday between 9:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (703) 308-2111. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3580 for regular communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 872-9306.

Thomas Barrett

December 1, 2003